

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are presently in the application. The application, as filed, had 9 claims. Previously presented Claims 10 – 13 were added at the time of the previous amendment. Claims 1-13 have been rejected. New claims 14-22 have been added to claim an isotropic thick film made from the composition of Claim 1.

The Examiner refused to enter the amendment as it presented new issues that require further consideration and because it presented additional claims without cancelling previous ones. Please charge any fees required for additional claims to Deposit Account-02-1928.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 4-9, 11 and 13 were rejected as obvious over Topfer et al. (Translated article: Preparation and Properties of Nd-Fe-B Thick Layers for Magnetic Standards). The Topfer article is cited as teaching a composition for forming a magnetic thick film comprising magnetic particles of NdFeB dispersed in an organic medium containing a polymer epoxy resin and solvent).

Regarding the limitation in applicant's claim 1 that the polymer be selected from polyurethane or phenoxy, although Topfer only recites the use of epoxy resin in the polymer in the magnetic composition, the Examiner asserts that it would have been within the skill of one skilled in the art to have recognized that other polymer materials could be suitable for magnetic compositions such as Topfer's. Regarding the limitation in applicants' Claim 4, the Examiner asserts that Topfer teaches that magnetic particles can be contained in the composition in amount of 65% by weight and that organic medium would be likely to be 35%, as is within the range as in applicant's Claim 5. Regarding the limitations in applicants' Claims 6, 7 and 11, related to screen printing, removal of solvent and treatment for orientation, the Examiner asserts that these procedures are either known from Topfer or within the skill of those skilled in the art to devise from Topfer.

Claims 2, 3 and 12 are rejected as unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over a Topfer et al. and a Benz et al. article. The Examiner asserts that Topfer teaches the composition of the instant invention but is silent as to the additives of metal used with NdFeB magnetic material. The Examiner argues that it would be within the purview of one of ordinary skill to have recognized that additives of any metal that is known to be used with NdFeB magnetic materials could be employed in the composition of Topfer with a reasonable expectation of success. Cobalt and Chromium are cited as taught by Benz. The Examiner asserts that absent a teaching of the criticality of the additive materials, there is no distinction over the

art.


Applicant again respectfully disagrees that the invention is obvious for the below reasons. While the cited references disclose that magnetic powder may be selected from powders in the Al-Ni-Co system, alkaline earth system, the Sm-Co system, and the Nd-Fe-B system, the magnetic particles taught in the cited references differ from the magnetic particles of the present invention in several ways. First, as mentioned previously, the magnetic field used to magnetize the particles of cited references has been applied in one particular direction/orientation to the present particles. In the present invention, the magnetic Nd-Fe-B or Neo powders used in the film composition "..., as printed, can be **isotropic** in nature such that the direction of any subsequently applied magnetic field can be done in any direction appropriate to the shape and thickness of the film. This isotropic limitation has now been added to claim 1. This property of magnetic isotropy is aided when these Neo powders are specifically used." (p. 9, ln. 35-p. 10, ln. 1). Furthermore, the Ne-Fe-B powders of the present invention may be formed by a dry-milling or atomization process that gives rise to a novel polymer thick film, when printed, which is isotropic in nature (See Examples 1 and 2). These thick films themselves, made from the compositions of Claims 1 and sequential claims, have been claimed herein in Claims 14-17 and in Claims 20-22.

In view of the above discussion, reconsideration of the final rejection is solicited and allowance of Claim 1-22, as amended, is respectfully requested. Request is also made for a RCE.

Should anything further be required to advance allowance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact applicants' attorney. Should there be any fee required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1928 (E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Company).

If there are any fees due for the additional claims submitted herein, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 04-1928, E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company.

Respectfully submitted,



BARBARA C. SIEGELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 30,684
Telephone: (302) 992-4931
Facsimile: (302) 892-7343

Dated: 4-6-06